



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

College Debates on World Government.

BY REV. WILBUR F. CRAFTS, PH. D.

For the city youth the "point of contact" or "approach" in the study of government is the policeman, the visible embodiment of the executive branch, through whom a child learns also of the judicial branch, for it is speedily known that the policeman hales offenders to court; and the legislative branch is soon discovered, for the cause of arrest is known to be the violation of some local, state or national law. (An outline of popular government will be sent by the International Reform Bureau, 206 Pa. Ave., S. E., Washington, D. C., to all who apply, with stamp. For help on arbitration apply to the American Peace Society, Boston.)

We suggest for discussion in all lands, but especially in the July holidays of the United States and Canada, the question, "Is it practicable to plan a world government for the twentieth century in which there shall be an effective international court and international legislature without an international police?"

The affirmative argument is a century of victories of arbitration, "not less renowned than war." Colleges might well make this question the centre of Washington's Birthday celebrations, for it was Washington who initiated the first international arbitration, in 1794, with Great Britain, to settle questions left over in the treaty that terminated the war of American independence, including questions of claims and of boundary. Many who were willing to arbitrate claims were opposed then, as many have been ever since, to arbitrate questions of boundary, on the jingo theory that the flag must never come down even where it was raised without right. It should be noted that in more than half the international arbitrations one or both these Anglo-Saxon nations that initiated international arbitration have been parties. Just one hundred years after that first international arbitration the Tenth Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, in 1904, was able to report that there had been two hundred international arbitrations, all of them — save one verdict recalled by the nation favored — carried into effect by the force of international public opinion, which it is therefore claimed may be relied on in the future, in place of an international police, especially as the sentiment favoring arbitration grows stronger every year, and would now brand any nation as an outcast that should refuse to accept an arbitral award from judges to whom it had officially committed its case. Such a nation would be in the position of "the man without a country" or of the Philadelphia councilmen who voted to rob the city by a corrupt lease of the city gas works, each of whom, through public indignation, speedily found himself the man without a constituency, and changed his vote.

The greatest single step in arbitration was the establishment of the Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration through the Conference called by the Czar and held on the 18th of May, 1899, a date which is annually celebrated as Peace Day in the schools of Massachusetts and Ohio, and is the most fitting date for debates and celebrations of arbitration in all lands. The Hague Court, established by twenty-six of the great nations of the world, is only an advisory plan by which mediation, mixed commissions of inquiry and international arbitration are approved and

provided for; but no nation is bound to arbitrate anything.

President Roosevelt was the first to send a case to this Court, which act gave it standing and efficiency. In 1904 every nation of Western Europe bound itself by special treaty with others to arbitrate certain classes of cases, except that Germany did not so agree with France. Only Denmark and the Netherlands, two nations that are foremost of all in the march of peace, agreed to arbitrate *all* differences. The others excepted questions of "independence," "vital interests" and "national honor." The second and third of these expressions are dangerously elastic. But "this epidemic of arbitration," as some one has called it, is no doubt a forward step, despite these exceptions, and will have a moral influence beyond the letter of the treaties, as is seen in the wonderful arbitration of the issues raised by the Russian war vessels firing on British fishing boats, where a question which many of the excited British public no doubt considered one of "vital interests" and "national honor," and which, if it had happened before the Hague Court was established, might have led to horrible war, was settled by methods of law.

The elastic exceptions noted above were in the ten treaties negotiated by President Roosevelt, which were killed by amendment in the Senate, whose unconstitutional veto by the "endless speech" would have made valueless the mere promise to make a treaty whenever a specific arbitration was needed. The very failure of these treaties is likely to advance the cause by the discussion it has caused and the proposal that will consequently go to the second Hague Convention, to be called by President Roosevelt at the close of the Eastern war, that the nations who are parties to it shall all unitedly agree, by one general treaty, what classes of cases they will always submit to its adjudication. Such a proposal will be discussed, on motion of American members, in the August (1905) meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, made up of national legislators of twenty-five nations to the number of two thousand, which is itself a volunteer parliament of nations and an advocate of an authorized world parliament, similarly constituted but by government appointment, which will meet at stated times to clarify and codify international law. Surely the suggestion of a "world government" is not "an iridescent dream," for in the Hague Court we have a half-developed international supreme court, already effective on a purely voluntary basis and likely to become compulsory, in such cases at least as are compulsory in the treaties recently made by most of its signatory powers; while in the Interparliamentary Union we have the pattern for an official world parliament, likely to be established soon, with powers at first advisory and later compulsory in determining international law. We have also a pattern for an international police force, such as might be used to enforce the decrees of the world court and the laws of the world parliament, in the international army that marched to the relief of the beleaguered legations in Peking.

But is such a use of force necessary or can the world government that is forming, unlike local, state, and national governments, enforce its laws and carry out its decrees by that international moral force to which the American colonies appealed, "a decent regard for the

opinions of mankind?" Mr. Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, has suggested that the most extreme measure that could be needed would be an international boycott of any nation refusing to obey any law or decree of the world government, which would be sufficiently accomplished, so far as government action is concerned, by the withdrawal of all diplomatic relations. This is not government without force, for each nation has its own police and army to compel its own citizens to accept decrees of the international court. Those who regard world government as a mere theory should also study "the concert of Europe" in the treaties of Westphalia, Paris, Berlin and Brussels, the three former being drawn by official peace congresses at the end of great wars to preserve the balance of power, the latter being a constitution of the Congo Free State made by seventeen nations acting together, which decreed, among other things, international prohibition.

Chancellor MacCracken of New York suggests the formation, in all colleges and high schools, of World Parliament Clubs — let us have them also in churches and among business men and workmen — to study and promote world government, which will some day realize "the parliament of man and the federation of the world."

WASHINGTON, D. C.

In Memoriam — John Hay.

"Peace hath her victories!" and such were thine,
O brave and constant friend of world-wide peace;
And as to-day we mourn thy sad decease,
And for thy bier a fitting chaplet twine,
We choose no laurels, nor bright bays to shine
As oft, in earlier years, above thy brow —
Nor yet the civic oaken crown — but now
The olive only shall thy locks confine.

Perhaps it was from that great heart who bore
The bitterest burdens of fraternal strife
That thou didst learn the paths of peace to love;
And yet, methinks, thine eyes rose far above
All human forms to Him whose flawless life
Triumphed for peace the while hate's thorns He wore.
— Ethelbert D. Warfield, in *The Independent*.

Christ and War.

It will be readily conceded — indeed, I do not suppose that it has ever been questioned — that Christ clearly and unmistakably taught the doctrine of non-resistance, the passive endurance of wrong; that he fully exemplified this doctrine in his life and in his death; that it is as fully set forth, with as complete implication that it was a universal principle, for all circumstances and times, as the law of love — in fact, that it is a part of that; that his disciples perfectly understood his teachings on this point, and, though some of them were hot-headed enough, followed his teaching and example with the most remarkable devotion. The example of the disciples was in turn followed by primitive Christianity. . . .

If fully satisfied that Jesus approved or permitted war, Christianity should rest in that conviction, since it holds that He spoke with absolute and final authority. In fact, it is not and never has been satisfied. The contradiction between this and the doctrine of non-resistance is too plain to be ignored by the most hardened believer. It is driven at the outset to apology. The only

explanation it can offer is that he changed his view. The necessary consequence is to conclude that the doctrine of non-resistance was impracticable, and that his earlier teaching was a delusion. But with the ever-widening sense of human brotherhood, the conviction has deepened that the law of love is the permanent and universal rule for the guidance of human conduct, and that war with its dreadful destruction and enormous suffering cannot be reconciled with it. Christianity, therefore, has shifted its ground. Oh, yes, war is horrible, and Christ did not approve of it as a permanent principle, but he allowed it for a season, because in the state of society which he found and which he left it is unavoidable. There will come a time of universal peace — in the millennium. War has not been eliminated because the evil passions of men, their selfishness, sin and folly have not been eliminated. When Christianity is everywhere accepted, war will cease. Very good. War is permissible, then, because based on the folly, selfishness and sin of men. Christ sanctioned it because it is sinful or selfish. But this will apply equally to lying, stealing, burglary, arson and murder. — *From H. E. Warner's "The Ethics of Force."*

Peace Work in Japan.

We have received a letter from a Japanese of prominence which reveals clearly that peace principles are already taking root deeply in Japan, notwithstanding the militarizing influence of the war and the bad effect upon the island empire of the impact of the great military powers of Europe. The writer, whose name we do not care to disclose without his knowledge and permission, says:

"The June number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* has been thankfully received. I am a Japanese and I am an advocate of peace. I believe even the most victorious war is ruinous in all its effects. I believe war is not only immoral but foolish; and I wonder why the wise 'children of this world' cannot see this plain fact. I have had the honor of standing against this war from its very beginning. You may feel assured that there are more lovers of peace in this country than you may imagine. Of course, we all love our country; and for that love's sake we love peace and hate war. When this war is over, you may count upon much advancement of the cause of peace in this country."

That Japanese gentleman has in him the stuff of which martyrs are made, and he has read his New Testament with a clearness of vision and insight which puts to shame many professed followers of Jesus of Nazareth in so-called Christian lands. The "Council of the Friends of Peace," an organization recently effected by a group of missionaries from four different missions in and about Tokio, is gradually bringing into association and coöperation the Japanese who hold views like those of the writer of this letter, and it is more than probable, considering the rapidity with which new ideas and movements of the better order take hold of the Japanese, that that country, when the war is over, may speedily become one of the most advanced and influential centers of the peace propaganda.